REMARKS

Claims 1 to 10 are retained in this application.

Claims 6 to 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komano et al. (U.S. 5,841,054) in view of Arnold et al. (U.S. 5,908,997). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 requires, among other features, at least one DSP peripheral device operative to drive the DAC. No such feature is taught or even remotely suggested by Komano et al., Arnold et al. or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the total combination as claimed. The examiner alleges that a DSP perispheral is shown in Fig. 3 of Komano et al. This allegation is respectfully traversed. Fig. 3 of Komano et al. is clearly stated to show the DSP 201, 202 and 203 and is not a DSP peripheral device.

Claim 6 further requires a general purpose processor (GPP) configured to read and parse the MIDI files stored in the flash memory to generate MIDI synthesizer commands therefrom, the DSP responsive to the MIDI synthesizer commands to synthesize audio signals and render the audio signals to the DAC via the at least one DSP peripheral device to implement a MIDI synthesizer. No such feature is taught or even remotely suggested by Komano et al., Arnold et al. or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the total combination as claimed. As noted above, Komano et al. does not teach or suggest the DSP peripheral device as claimed. Furthermore, even were Arnold et al. to teach a general purpose processor (GPP) configured to read and parse the MIDI files stored in the flash memory to generate MIDI synthesizer commands therefrom, the DSP responsive to the MIDI synthesizer commands to synthesize audio

signals and render the audio signals to the DAC via the at least one DSP peripheral device to implement a MIDI synthesizer, which it does not, there still is no teaching or suggestion to combine Arnold et al. with Komano et al.

Claim 7 requires the same features as discussed above with reference to claim 6 except in broader terms. For example, the driving means for driving the data converting means can be the DSP peripheral device which is not taught or suggested by the applied references as discussed above. Also, the second data processing means (which can be the general purpose computer) for reading and parsing the MIDI files stored in the data storing means to generate MIDI synthesizer commands therefrom, wherein the first data processing means is responsive to the MIDI synthesizer commands to synthesize audio signals and render the audio signals to the data converting means via the driving means to implement a MIDI synthesizer is not taught or suggested by the applied references as discussed above..

Claims 8 to 10 depend from claim 7 and therefore define patentably over the applied references for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 7.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Jay M. Cantor
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 19,906
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)
(972) 917-5293 (Phone)
(972) 917-4418 (Fax)